



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/616,805	07/14/2000	Michael P. Lyle	RECOP002	6607

21912 7590 03/03/2004

VAN PELT & YI LLP
10050 N. FOOTHILL BLVD #200
CUPERTINO, CA 95014

EXAMINER

ALI, AHMEDUR R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2004

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/616,805

Applicant(s)

LYLE ET AL.

Examiner

Ahmedur Ali

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The application has been examined. Claims 1-24 are pending in this Office Action.

Priority

2. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged to U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/143,821, filed July 14, 1999, and to U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/151,531, filed August 30, 1999.

Drawings

3. The drawings filed on July 14, 2000 are objected to by the Draftsperson. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office Action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The references cited in the IDS, PTO-1449, Paper No. 4, has been considered.

Specification

5. The examiner suggests the Applicant's to remove the TITLE of the invention from the Abstract sheet on page 48 accordingly.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-6, 10-13, 15-17, and 20-24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernardo et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,247,032 ('Bernardo' hereinafter) in view of Kelley U.S. Patent No. 4,719,566. With respect to claim 1, Bernardo teach a method for generating computer file system content (see abstract; col. 2, lines 33-37), comprising:

creating a template (see col. 2, lines 44-67 to col. 3, lines 1-5);

providing a collection of data items available to be inserted into the template (see col. 2, lines 44-67 to col. 3, lines 1-5); and

populating the template with at least one data item form the collection (see col. 3, lines 17-35).

Bernardo do not explicitly disclose generating fictitious content.

Kelley discloses generating fictitious content (see abstract; col. 2, lines 5-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kelley within the system of Bernardo to arrive at the invention as claimed because both references are direct to generating computer file system content, and the implementation of generating fictitious file system content would prevent an attacker seeking to gain unauthorized access to a computer

or computer network by luring the would be attacker to non working files, further increasing the level of security of the network by letting only authorized users to access the network. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to extend the capability of the network by incorporating the fictitious generating content feature of Kelley to improve the security and versatility of the combined system.

8. Claim 2 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1, wherein the collection of data items comprises one or more names (see col. 7, lines 18-36).

9. Claim 3 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1, wherein the collection of data items comprises one or more dates (see col. 7, lines 18-63).

10. Claim 4 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1, wherein the template is an e-mail message requiring at least one item of data to be complete (see col. 7, lines 18-36).

11. Claim 5 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1, wherein the template is a word processing document requiring at least one item of data to be complete (see col. 1, lines 42-61).

12. Claim 6 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1, wherein the template is a spreadsheet requiring at least one item of data to be complete (see col. 1, lines 42-61).

13. Claim 10 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1, wherein the step of populating comprises correlating a random number to an item of data in the collection (see col. 7, lines 18-36).

14. Claim 11 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1, wherein the step of populating comprises inserting an item of data into the template (see col. 7, lines 18-36).

15. Bernardo teach claim 12 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1.

Bernardo do not explicitly disclose further comprising including at least one spelling error in the template.

Kelley disclose further comprising at least one spelling error (see col. 3, lines 25-66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kelley within the system of Bernardo to arrive at the invention as claimed because both references are directed to generating computer file system content and the implementation of including at least one spelling error in the template would enable the system to determine the nature and location of the errors that are introduced into at least certain portions of the generated file content, further providing an improved level of authenticity of the file content by isolating where the intruder is attempting to access the network system, further providing an increased level of security and improving the versatility of the combined system.

16. Bernardo teach claim 13 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1.

Bernardo do not explicitly disclose further comprising altering the populated template to introduce at least one spelling error.

Kelley disclose further comprising introducing at least one spelling error (see col. 3, lines 25-66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kelley within the system of Bernardo to arrive at the invention as claimed because both references are directed to generating

computer file system content and the implementation of including at least one spelling error in the template would enable the system to determine the nature and location of the errors that are introduced into at least certain portions of the generated file content, further providing an improved level of authenticity of the file content by isolating where the intruder is attempting to access the network system, further providing an increased level of security and improving the versatility of the combined system.

17. Bernardo teach claim 15 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1.

Bernardo do not explicitly disclose further comprising introducing at least one grammatical error into the populated template.

Kelley disclose introducing at least one grammatical error (see col. 3, lines 25-66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kelley within the system of Bernardo to arrive at the invention as claimed because both references are directed to generating computer file system content and the implementation of including at least one grammatical error in the template would enable the system to determine the nature and location of the errors that are introduced into at least certain portions of the generated file content, further providing an improved level of authenticity of the file content by isolating where the intruder is attempting to access the network system, further providing an increased level of security and improving the versatility of the combined system.

18. Claim 16 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1, further comprising:

creating at least one other template (see col. 2, lines 44-62); and
populating the at least one other template with at least one data item from the collection (see col. 3, lines 17-35).

19. Claim 17 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1, further comprising selecting data items in the collection to populate the template based at least in part on the relative probability of occurrence of each data item (see col. 7, lines 18-36).

20. With respect to claim 20, Bernardo teach a method for generating computer file system content (see abstract; col. 2, lines 33-37), comprising:

creating a plurality of templates (see col. 2, lines 44-62);
providing a collection of data items to be inserted into the templates (see col. 2, lines 44-67 to col. 3, lines 1-5);
selecting one or more of said templates (see col. 3, lines 17-35); and
populating each of the selected templates with at least one data item from the collection (see col. 3, lines 17-35).

Bernardo do not explicitly disclose fake fictitious content.

Kelley disclose generating fake content (see abstract; col. 2, lines 5-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kelley within the system of Bernardo to arrive at the invention as claimed because both references are direct to generating computer file system content, and the implementation of generating fake file system content would prevent an attacker seeking to gain unauthorized access to a computer

or computer network by luring the would be attacker to non working files, further increasing the level of security of the network by letting only authorized users to access the network. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to extend the capability of the network by incorporating the fake generating content feature of Kelley to improve the security and versatility of the combined system.

21. Claim 21 rejected as above in rejecting claim 20, further associating a probability of occurrence with each template and wherein the step of selecting comprises selecting one or more of said templates based at least in part on the associated probability of occurrence (see col. 7, lines 18-63).

22. Claim 22 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1, wherein the template requires that at least two items of data be compatible with one another (see col. 7, lines 18-63).

23. With respect to claim 23, Bernardo teach a system for generating computer file system content (see abstract; col. 2, lines 33-37), comprising:

a computer configured to populate a template with at least one data item form a collection of data items available to be inserted into the template (see col. 3, lines 17-35); and

a database configured to store the collection (see col. 7, lines 18-63);

wherein the computer includes memory configured to store the populated template in a file system (see col. 7, lines 18-63).

Bernardo do not explicitly disclose generating fictitious content.

Kelley disclose generating fictitious content (see abstract; col. 2, lines 5-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kelley within the system of Bernardo to arrive at the invention as claimed because both references are direct to generating computer file system content, and the implementation of generating fictitious file system content would prevent an attacker seeking to gain unauthorized access to a computer or computer network by luring the would be attacker to non working files, further increasing the level of security of the network by letting only authorized users to access the network. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to extend the capability of the network by incorporating the fictitious generating content feature of Kelley to improve the security and versatility of the combined system.

24. With respect to claim 24, Bernardo teach a computer program product for generating file system content for a computer (see abstract; col. 2, lines 33-37), the computer program product being embodied in a computer readable medium and comprising computer instructions for:

retrieving a template (see col. 2, lines 44-62);

accessing a collection of data items available to be inserted into the template (see col. 2, lines 44-67 to col. 3, lines 1-5); and

populating the template with at least one data item from the collection (see col. 3, lines 17-35).

Bernardo do not explicitly disclose generating fictitious content.

Kelley disclose generating fictitious content (see abstract; col. 2, lines 5-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kelley within the system of Bernardo to arrive at the invention as claimed because both references are direct to generating computer file system content, and the implementation of generating fictitious file system content would prevent an attacker seeking to gain unauthorized access to a computer or computer network by luring the would be attacker to non working files, further increasing the level of security of the network by letting only authorized users to access the network. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to extend the capability of the network by incorporating the fictitious generating content feature of Kelley to improve the security and versatility of the combined system.

25. Claims 7-9, 14 and 18-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernardo et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,247,032 ('Bernardo' hereinafter) in view of Kelley U.S. Patent No. 4,719,566, in further view of Colvin, Sr. U.S. Patent No. 6,041,123 ('Colvin' hereinafter).

26. Claim 7 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1, and Bernardo in view of Kelley teach all the limitations set forth above in claim 1.

Bernardo and Kelley do not explicitly disclose wherein the step of populating comprises receiving a number from a random number generator.

Colvin disclose a random number generator (see col. 5, lines 22-25; col. 6, lines 60-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Colvin within the combined system of

Bernardo and Kelley to arrive at the invention as claimed because the references are direct to generating computer file system content, and the implementation of a random number generator would enable the network system to determine the intervals at which additional file content is generated, further increasing the level of security by providing a more realistic deception environment, furthermore improving the versatility of the combined systems.

27. As to claim 8, Bernardo and Kelley do not explicitly show a pseudo random number generator. However, Colvin teaches a pseudo random number generator (see col. 5, lines 22-25; col. 6, lines 60-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bernardo in view of Kelley in further view of Colvin for the same reasons set forth in claim 7 above.

28. As to claim 9, Bernardo and Kelley do not explicitly show a pseudo random number generator employs a unique key to generate numbers. However, Colvin teaches a pseudo random number generator employs a unique key to generate numbers (see col. 6, lines 60-67 to col. 7, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bernardo in view of Kelley in further view of Colvin for the same reasons set forth in claim 8 above.

29. Claim 14 rejected as above in rejecting claim 13, and Bernardo and Kelley teach all the limitations set forth above as indicated in claim 13.

Bernardo and Kelley do not explicitly disclose wherein the step of populating comprises receiving a number from a random number is used to determine what the least spelling error will be.

Colvin disclose a random number (see col. 5, lines 22-25; col. 6, lines 60-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Colvin within the combined system of Bernardo and Kelley to arrive at the invention as claimed because the references are direct to generating computer file system content, and the implementation of a random number would enable the network system to determine the intervals at which additional file content is generated, further increasing the level of security by providing a more realistic deception environment, furthermore improving the versatility of the combined systems.

30. Claim 18 rejected as above in rejecting claim 1, and Bernardo in view of Kelley teach all the limitations set forth above in claim 1.

Bernardo and Kelly do not explicitly disclose a random number and the relative probability of occurrence of each data item.

Colvin disclose a random number and the relative probability of occurrence of each data item (see col. 5, lines 22-25; col. 6, lines 60-67 to col. 7, lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Colvin within the combined system of Bernardo and Kelley to arrive at the invention as claimed because the references are direct to generating computer file system content, and the implementation of a random number generator would enable the network system to determine the intervals at which additional file content is generated, further increasing the level of security by providing a

Art Unit: 2131

more realistic deception environment, furthermore improving the versatility of the combined systems.

31. As to claim 19, Bernardo and Kelley do not explicitly show a pseudo random number generator provides the random number. However, Colvin teaches a pseudo random number generator employs a random number (see col. 6, lines 60-67 to col. 7, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Bernardo in view of Kelley in further view of Colvin for the same reasons set forth in claim 18 above.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bonnell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,655,081) disclose a system for monitoring and managing computer resources and applications across a distributed computing environment using an intelligent autonomous agent architecture.

Lowell (U.S. Patent No. 6,381,632) disclose a method and apparatus for tracking network usage.

Leblang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,574,898) disclose a dynamic software version auditor which monitors a process to provide a list of objects that are accessed.

Holm et al. (U.S. Patent 6,260,016) disclose a speech synthesis employing prosody templates.

Hypponen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,577,920) disclose a computer virus screening.

Newton et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,771,291) disclose a user identification and authentication system using ultra long identification keys and ultra large databases of identification keys for secure remote terminal access to a host computer.

Ruvolo (U.S. Patent No. 5,928,363) disclose a method and means for preventing unauthorized resumption of suspended authenticated Internet sessions using locking and trapping measures.


Donoho et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,664) disclose a method and apparatus for computed relevance messaging.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ahmedur Ali whose telephone number is 305-4667. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ara


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100